

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

September 17, 1998
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

| # | Agenda Items | Presenters |
|--------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 1. | Meeting Minutes | Benny Lile |
| 2. | High School Testing Window | Anne Keene |
| 3. | Practical Living/Vocational Studies | Rhonda Sims |
| 4. | Scholastic Audit Issues | Bob Lumsden |
| 5. | Commonwealth School Improvement Funds | Bob Lumsden |
| 6. | Scholastic Audit Subcommittee Report | Roger Pankratz |
| 7. | School Report Card Subcommittee Report | Maxine Johnson |
| 8. | District Accountability Subcommittee Report | Benny Lile |
| 9. | Naming CATS Assessment Components | Anne Keene |
| 10. | Writing Advisory Committee Report | Sue Rigney |
| 11. | NTAPAA Report | Sue Rigney |
| 12. | SCAAC Next Day Meeting | Anne Keene |
| Adjournment | | |

SCAAC Meeting Minutes September 17, 1998

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.

Chairperson Anne Keene called the meeting to order. Jon Frederick called the roll.

Members Present:

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Jon Akers | Maxie Johnson | Gary Mielcarek |
| Jamie Bowling | Anne Keene | Roger Pankratz |
| Kay Freeland | Benny Lile | Bob Young |
| Suzanne Guyer | | |

Gene Wilhoit introduced the new Associate in the Office of Assessment and Accountability, Dr. Cheryl King. After the introduction, Kay Freeland shared an article from Kentucky Living which highlighted the contribution of Council member Gary Mielcarek.

Chairperson Anne Keene outlined the issues on the agenda for the two day meeting session.

The agenda included discussion on the following:

Thursday

- Testing sequence (spring/fall)
- Scholastic audit issues
- Information items as listed on the printed agenda
- Subcommittees reports
- The National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) Report

Friday

- The assessment blueprint
- Core content match activities
- School report card issues.

Meeting Time: 10 hours and 30 minutes

1. Meeting Minutes

Anne Keene

Minutes from September 2 were discussed for corrections and revisions. Revisions and corrections were made.

SCAAC Motion:

Suzanne Guyer moved the minutes be approved as corrected; motion was seconded by Jon Akers and the minutes were approved by an a voice vote. Jon Akers and Gary Mielcarek asked that Jon Frederick and Loretta Russell be commended for their hard work on meeting logistics and the minutes. This commendation was noted for the record.

2. High School Testing Window

Anne Keene

Chairperson Anne Keene led the Council into the testing sequence discussion and called attention to the document "High School Testing Window—Alternate Proposal." She noted that the document reflects some compromises and changes resultant from the last Council meeting and discussion. In this alternative proposal, seniors would still be responsible for the writing portfolio and also for the on-demand writing prompt which is the ninety minute writing portion of the assessment.

Roger Pankratz asked if the configuration would pose any problems as to whether or not the core content would be sufficiently covered by the time the testing occurred. Bob Young and Jon Akers both commented that they did not see any significant problem with that issue. The concern is that students be well prepared in the core content by the time the assessments are taken. On area of particular concern is the placement of the reading assessment at the 10th grade level.

Jon Akers addressed the "senioritis" problem; Jon feels that the perception that the senior year is a "waste or wash" doesn't take in to account what he sees happening with seniors during that final year of high school. The concerns include whether or not seniors can be motivated in the spring to give the assessment a serious effort unless there is some sort of accountability and impact on the seniors from any spring administered assessments. Jon Akers disagrees with the premise that unless seniors are assessed that we are discounting the learning which takes place in the senior year.

As part of the discussion, Deputy Commissioner Wilhoit noted that if assessments are put in earlier years such as is the case with reading moving down into 10th grade, then there would be adjustments in the assessment itself so that the items would be appropriate for 10th grade students. Kay Freeland noted that by moving reading into the 10th grade there would be opportunity to intervene with instruction that would help those students graduate with better reading skills. She feels that testing at the upper grades affords little opportunity to diagnose and re-mediate. Jon Akers suggested that while reading might be assessed in 10th grade that does not mean that sophomores have covered all they should have in reading or reached their maximum performance level in reading. Suzanne Guyer agreed with Jon Akers that testing reading before the junior or senior years would give opportunity for the school to give the students as much help as possible. She also agreed with Jon's premise that the senior year is not a discounted year just because there is less assessment in that grade.

Benny Lile asked if the practical living/vocational studies assessment would be sufficient

to prepare graduating seniors for transition to post-secondary life. Bob Young suggested that it would be preferable to have the seniors do the on-demand writing prompt and have that part of the assessment scored at the school level. This would seem feasible since the state has invested heavily in preparing teachers to evaluate writing.

3. Practical Living/Vocational Studies

Rhonda Sims

Chairperson Anne Keene recognized Rhonda Sims who discussed the components of the various practical living/vocational studies assessment and where those pieces of content are covered or where they might be covered. She noted that these areas are generally distributed over various grades and in different courses—there are simply no courses entitled practical living and vocation studies. Rather, the content is spread over different grades and through various courses. Rhonda sees the answer to where the content is taught and how is taught as very much a school by school issue.

Benny Lile asked Sue Rigney if there any technical considerations such as equating.

Sue reiterated Dr. Catterall's opinion that equating should not guide the consideration but that the Council needed to focus on "getting it right."

SCAAC Motion:

Jon Akers moved that the alternate proposal be accepted by the Council; Roger Pankratz seconded the motion. Bob Young asked for clarification on whether there would be any impact on RFP issues already in its final stages. Sue's answer was that there should not be any appreciable impact. Roger Pankratz noted that there are budgetary restraints that also come into play. In his absence, Anne Keene shared her discussion with Council member Bob Sexton who supported the alternate proposal. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The Chair recessed for a morning break.

After the morning break, Anne Keene reconvened the Council.

4. Scholastic Audit Issues

Bob Lumsden

Anne Keene introduced for discussion the scholastic audit issues. Bob Lumsden was recognized to present a report on the scholastic audit; Bob also noted that he would be turning the discussion over to Gordon Newton. A number of handouts were given to all Council members as part of the presentation. Bob noted that the department staff has been engaged in working with the Council's subcommittee. He also recommended

that Commonwealth School Improvement Funds distributions be made as soon as possible. He also noted that NTAPAA's response to the scholastic audit had been made in the absence of a model. Bob used a set of posters illustrating "one sample of accountability model," and the "scholastic audit process." Bob noted that there is some tension between what an assessment measures and how that assessment can be used to inform good classroom instruction and to meet the needs of students. The scholastic audit should be based on broad premises, not just on the accountability model.

Roger Pankratz said that teachers need good examples of proficient work, especially in science. He feels that teachers need to internalize the qualities of proficient work because without this, teachers are frustrated and unable to reach the goal of proficiency.

Gordon Newton took over the presentation at this point. He used a number of documents addressing key issues. The first document was "Organizing Questions." Gordon went through each of the questions briefly.

SCAAC Questions:

1. What is the purpose of the scholastic audit?
2. What are the basic assumptions upon which this model was built?
3. Which schools are eligible for an audit?
4. How do we determine the level of service (Commonwealth School Improvement Funds and Highly Skilled Educators) to a large number of schools in a timely manner?
5. Who is on the "audit team"?
6. What data does the "audit team" collect and review?
7. What are the "quality controls" for this audit process?
8. What is the Request for Assistance approval process?

KDE Response:

Gordon led the Council through some answers to the eight organizing questions using the handout packet provided each Council member. The model presented three levels of audit: Level I—School Self-Study; Level II—School/District Scholastic Audit Team; Level III—Scholastic Audit Team. The presentation also included a chart "Curriculum Audit Outline." The outline had five major headings: curriculum alignment, unit development, lesson plan development, best practices, and standards. Gordon elaborated on each of the points.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Roger Pankratz asked if it were not possible in the KIRIS results to find a way to do a specific breakdown of item analysis. It was noted in response that there are indeed such item analyzes available and these have been available.

Gordon Newton continued his presentation discussing scholastic audit options. Schools could work within their own structure to audit, decide on needs, and plan to meet those needs; in the Level II option, schools could ask for outside assistance and write an

Request for Assistance to get funding and other assistance. Discussion centered on the various ways these levels and activities within the levels work and to what extent the levels overlap. At what place does outside pressure come into play in the audit process? How is the determination made of whether a district/school has properly identified areas of greatest need in their internal or district audit process. Bob Young asked if the Scholastic Audit Review Committee would review all audits and intervene in the work of the school.

Gordon Newton noted that there was some latitude in the interim or voluntary assistance period prior to whenever the new model becomes effective.

Sue Rigney raised the possibility that there would be schools that would not or did not recognize they had a problem or problems. Bob Lumsden said that such schools would be caught in the next cycle. He noted that in the new model state intervention should be the "last resort." The question is how to define "last resort." The 1998-2000 are the voluntary assistance years and in these years schools have options on how to be involved and what assistance would be appropriate. The question is how to design the model for the years after 2000.

The question was asked whether schools with extremely low performance should automatically be placed in a Level III audit in 2000? One answer or suggestion included the following observation: If schools put together a solid plan after analyzing problems through their own initiative and scholastic audit process, then these schools should be given the opportunity to work on their improvement plans before any outside intervention. Kay Freeland noted that the concern was to consider the needs of schools and to offer assistance that meets the needs.

Gary Mielcarek asked whether or not there would be some consideration for fulfilling requests from schools in Request for Assistance as to the true nature of the need—if a school asked for assistance and it is determined that the request is either not an appropriate request nor one that seems excessive, what would be the best scenario?

Options for providing assistance were discussed including using schools helping schools, funding options, using any and all resources available such as Kentucky Leadership Academy and Highly Skilled Educators resources.

Roger Pankratz asked Jon Akers if the proposition of having schools helping schools were a practical option and how that option might work. Jon proposed a cadre or a team that would be able to travel to other schools and provide capacity building strategies and other kinds of assistance. Jon posed his answer as a problem of logistics and scheduling.

Jerry Lunney asked Bob Lumsden whether the assistance would be vertical or horizontal? Bob answered that the issue had not been discussed to date. Anne Keene asked whether there would be some financial assistance to defray the cost of one school helping another.

5. Commonwealth School Improvement Funds

Bob Lumsden

At this point, the Council turned its focus to the use of Commonwealth School Improvement Funds. Anne called attention to the Commonwealth School Improvement Funds distribution from the charts provided. The percentages from the chart were discussed. The chart distributes Commonwealth School Improvement Funds by increments of 25% for management costs and requests for assistance grants; 25% for school self-study; 25% for school/district self-study; and 25% for Level III scholastic team audit and Highly Skilled Educators. The funding/resources go to Level III if they are not used at Levels I or II.

Bob Lumsden suggested that there have been good results and improvement when schools did some kind of self-study or other school level initiative. Roger Pankratz asked Bob Lumsden to estimate as best he could the number of schools that would require assistance at the various levels. Specifically, Roger asked how many schools would be included at each level and how the 25% would be appropriate at those levels. Bob noted that the distribution percentages had been done arbitrarily and these could certainly be adjusted. Roger Pankratz and Anne Keene expressed concern about a plan for the period after this voluntary interim transition period which ends in 2000.

Bob Lumsden said that his best guess would be that roughly half the schools would do their own internal audit and work out the problems while the other half would require assistance/funding/Highly Skilled Educators. The answer is dependent on what accountability model is chosen.

Sue Rigney questioned whether schools could not somehow "buy" their own Highly Skilled Educators? She mentioned the pool of past Distinguished Educators which have had training and experience and who might be available as consultants. Bob Lumsden said that much would depend on when the DE went through the program and whether that DE had maintained skills. Obviously, some retired DE's would be more available than others and some would be better equipped to provide assistance.

Anne Keene questioned the distributions by equal parts of 25% and if that percentage is really realistic or appropriate.

Suzanne Guyer asked if the 25% in Level III which includes Highly Skilled Educators included the cost of the Highly Skilled Educators. Bob said that it did not include the cost for the Highly Skilled Educators. Discussion followed on some of the rationale for the distribution.

Kay Freeland asked if schools falling in the "assistance zone" on the accountability model after 2000 would have an option of whether or to have assistance. Schools after this interim would have to receive assistance—not on a voluntary basis. Jon Akers noted that some of the tools and materials developed in the past DE program would be

"tool kits" which might be one way to provide some meaningful assistance.

Anne asked if she were correct in her understanding that a school in a reward category would be eligible for assistance or part of the 25% distribution. Bob and Gordon answered that would be true only if that school got funds to help another school—schools helping schools. Bob suggested that the kind of assistance schools are looking for in the future is far different and harder than the assistance needed in the present.

Anne Keene asked Bob to address the quality control element—what is that component? Bob answered that the quality control component is Scholastic Audit Review Committee. David Allen commented that another quality control element would be the plan submitted and the list of activities proposed by the school prior to receiving and continuing any assistance/funding.

Chairperson Anne Keene recessed the Council for lunch. Anne Keene reconvened the Council after the lunch break, and Jon Frederick called the roll. Ten members answered the roll call and a quorum was met.

6. Scholastic Audit Subcommittee Report

Roger Pankratz

The Chair called on Roger Pankratz to report on the Scholastic Audit Subcommittee's work. He emphasized the conclusion that local boards of education should acknowledge the difference between the schools recommendations and those of the Scholastic Audit Review Committee and take responsibility for what the school decides to do. Roger also expressed his opinion that the message that schools should focus on Core Content for Assessment as the correct document to align curriculum to instead of just looking the new Program of Students document. Roger also stressed the importance of correct and appropriate interpretation of assessment data. Further, Roger suggested that schools sharpen their focus on the standards for the proficient performance level.

Bob Young and Benny Lile responded to Roger's comments. They both felt that Roger's concerns about assuring that teachers understand fully the standards necessary for proficient achievement were well-founded. Bob Young expressed his concern that the Scholastic Audit not be seen as a "hoop to jump through" just to get funding and other assistance; rather, the Audit should be something more significant and meaningful with good practice as the end result. Suzanne Guyer noted that there was widespread feeling that in cases like the reading and science assessment, that the science standards are much harder to achieve.

Jamie Bowling agreed with Roger Pankratz that local school districts, boards of education must be held accountable to see that good practices and strong programs are available and valued at the local level. Jamie said that because local boards are

ultimately accountable they must be included in all communications.

Chairperson Anne Keene focused on one of the key purposes of the Scholastic Audit to determine the correctness or appropriateness of a school's classification. She noted that House Bill 53 also requires an appeals process. Discussion of the specific intent of House Bill 53 on the appeals process followed. Sue Rigney noted the distinction between the "triage" aspect of audit and the level and kinds of assistance a school would require based on an audit. It was clarified that the appeals process was the only way a school could appeal the classification and have it reclassified; the Scholastic Audit would provide a diagnostic component to determine level and kinds of assistance.

There was discussion on the language and intent of the language in House Bill 53. The Council looked again at the wording of House Bill 53 regarding "appropriateness of classification." Bob Lumsden offered his perspective and suggested the immediate concern is allocating resources to schools to assist them in meeting their goals.

The following represent some of the questions surrounding the issues on classification. Are scores the sole criterion for determining school classification? What are the other factors?

Bonnie Brinly noted that the problem may be one of understanding what is required during the next two years and then what happens after 2000. The next two years are fairly well laid out in the law; the "new" model should be the focal point in looking forward. There are many options in redesigning the system which can effectively deal with past problems and create a new more acceptable model.

Further discussion followed on the role of the Scholastic Audit, the function of the Scholastic Audit Review Committee, and appeals procedures.

Chairperson Anne Keene asked Kentucky Board of Education Chairperson Helen Mountjoy to comment and advise the Council on the questions that the Board has posed as the critical ones that need immediate answers. The questions included: what should be included in a scholastic audit—is the audit the same in all schools? What kinds of assistance will come out of a scholastic audit process?

Roger Pankratz suggested that the Council look at the policy issues presented by Gordon Newton, Bob Lumsden, and David Allen. Some preliminary answers needed to be formulated. At this point, Suzanne Guyer commented on her concern that whatever decisions are made that these be "user friendly" and clear so that educators and all stakeholders will find them accessible and comprehensible.

Gordon Newton asked the Council if they were comfortable with the quality control concepts he outlined. Schools would submit an analysis of data and their plans to address the needs or areas of concern/low achievement; after this, the reports would be evaluated. Bob Young asked for clarification on whether schools who had satisfactory growth would have to submit the result of a scholastic audit and then have that audit

reviewed. The clarification emphasized that after the year 2000 all schools would have to participate in a scholastic audit and have the audit reviewed. In the interim, the voluntary assistance program is mandated in House Bill 53.

Benny Lile emphasized his concern about getting assistance on its way to schools that need that assistance at the earliest possible date—the desired effect is to have schools move in a steady progression toward the 2014 goal of 100 (out of a possible 140). Waiting any longer than is absolutely necessary to determine level and type of assistance seems unwise.

Jamie Bowling asked for clarification on the difference between voluntary assistance in the next two years and the model that will begin after 2000. Kay Freeland noted her concern that having a two year interval without any mechanism to assist schools who may be in trouble and in need of assistance would be highly detrimental. Kay feels that there needs to be serious consideration to resolve this dilemma.

Sue Rigney emphasized that House Bill 53 does provide some options for meaningful assistance during the interim. Helen Mountjoy noted that she felt KBE would be receptive to recommendations to bring all pressure possible to bear on schools which need assistance during the interim years of 1999-2000. She, too, feels that two years is too long to wait to address needs.

Bob Lumsden expressed concern that the problems with assistance be seen not so much as a state responsibility but rather that the focus should shift to the local level. Generally, local capacity building was discussed as one of the most significant elements in moving schools forward.

Once again it was noted that the assistance program should not be seen as just a funding source. The following list of concerns related to scholastic audit were posted on a chart and discussed as key issues:

1. Quick assistance to low-performing schools (need to define low-performing.
2. Establish priority order for data evaluation (see Pankratz paper).
3. Define/support local data evaluation process.
4. Greater specificity regarding use of Commonwealth School Improvement Funds.
5. Base district accountability on effective support for local capacity building.
6. Local audit must focus on student performance and teaching practices—scholastic audit, no excuses.
7. How to involve universities in local capacity building as partners (consider funding problems).
8. How to allocate regional resources.
 - a. by number of schools
 - b. by number of students (school size)
 - c. by level of need

The Council was asked to look at the Scholastic Audit plan and policy issues presented by Gordon Newton, Bob Lumsden, and David Allen and approve it or make

suggestions. The first policy issue is "quality control." Consistency from region to region in establishing procedure for approving Scholastic Audit Review Committee decisions would be necessary as indicative of good quality control. Scholastic Audit Review Committee should be charged with the task of informing local boards of education of their findings.

Allocation of Commonwealth School Improvement Funds must be equitable from region to region. Staff was asked to provide some information and plans on how that equity could be accomplished across all regions.

The assignment of Highly Skilled Educators -- what would be the basis for assignment? Do lowest scoring schools get preference? Low Social-Economic Status schools? Suzanne Guyer suggested that the Council might consider using a rubric which would set up different points as qualifiers for assignment of Highly Skilled Educators. Bob Young asked if the data from Level I and Level II couldn't be used as factors in the considerations for assignments. As another concern, Helen Mountjoy suggested that there might be some way to match up Highly Skilled Educators with schools by needs and an Highly Skilled Educators particular experiences and strengths.

Linda Sheffield reiterated her concerns that high scoring schools may need assistance; she emphasized the point that these schools may be needy. Linda believes that these schools are often overlooked when in fact they may need assistance.

The Chair called a recess. Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council.

Anne Keene outlined the work for the remainder of the work session. She emphasized the Council's role in reviewing the issues and asked the Council to consider the remaining policy issues on Scholastic Audit; she also announced dinner at 5:45 p.m. and then earlier adjournment so that Council can have some down time to read the technical panel's report.

The Council discussed question #3 on the Policy Issues document. The issue of where Highly Skilled Educators should be assigned is included in this question. Roger Pankratz discussed this issue and remarked that in general he favored giving the most assistance to schools farthest behind—a school where the Highly Skilled Educators is most needed, i.e. technical assistance. Dr. Jerry Lunney (OEA) was recognized and remarked that the work DE's had done in the past was geared toward improvement of test scores; he feels that the approach should now focus on "learning" versus just targeting specific strategies to increase test performance. Anne Keene noted that she sees a direct connection between improved test scores and good instructional practices.

The Council discussed question #4 on the Policy Issues document dealing with

automatic inclusion of schools with a history of extremely low performance; should these schools get a Level III designation and an automatic scholastic audit in 2000? Anne Keene asked if the Council agreed that the lowest performing schools should have the Level III Scholastic Audit. The Council was in agreement on this issue.

Anne Keene noted that Council member Maynard Thomas was now present and commended him for having a perfect attendance at all Council meetings.

Maxie Johnson asked whether there had been a decision on the distribution of Commonwealth School Improvement Funds. It was noted that staff in Bob Lumsden's office planned to run some simulations to provide the Council with varying options on how the funds would be divided based on a number of variables including number of students and number of schools in the regions. Helen Mountjoy expressed her opinion that the state not give the message that money is the solution to all problems, nor that funding alone will accomplish all that is needed to promote success and improved continuous growth. Gary Mielcarek asked what kinds of material or funding would actually make a difference. Gary suggested that the selling point should be the provision of multiple kinds of assistance/support.

Discussion followed on the interface of Level I and Level II assistance. Some schools may not require funding at high levels and if at Level I the funding is not depleted, then those funds can carryover to Level II. Bob Lumsden indicated that each level was attached to the previous level and naturally flows from level to level.

Anne Keene asked Bob Lumsden how long he thought Level I would take; Bob's approximation was that most schools could do the work in two days, noting this is not an exact science. Questions followed which expressed doubt that most schools are actually equipped to handle this task in such a short time; also, the question included the ability of schools to analyze and interpret data and design a plan to address needs in a meaningful manner.

Sue Rigney asked Bob Lumsden if it were possible for the state to develop a one time goal/plan to use the 3 million dollar funds? Bob indicated that it was within the realm of possibility. The question is one of willingness to adopt such a one time plan/goal.

Chairperson Anne Keene called for any additional questions about the Scholastic Audit. Linda Sheffield asked if teacher preparation would be assessed—specifically, Linda asked if teachers are teaching in their fields and are they well-grounded in the content they teach. The focus of this discussion was on the strength of teachers as they prepare to teach both through quality teacher education and depth of content they are taught. Roger Pankratz asked if open-response questions had been used anywhere to evaluate teachers themselves. Bob noted that there are plans to move in that direction and some work has been done toward that end.

7. School Report Card Subcommittee Report

Maxine Johnson

At this point, Maxie Johnson gave a brief progress report on the School Report Card Subcommittee. Maxie spoke briefly and called on other Subcommittee members to add to her comments. The Subcommittee has not made any final suggestions at this point; the work will continue.

Anne Keene noted that on the roll-out plan this topic would be presented to KBE in December. The Subcommittees will need to meet between now and that time to finish discussions. Maynard Thomas asked if everyone had received the material on the School Report Card.

8. District Accountability Subcommittee Report

Benny Lile

Benny Lile was recognized to report on the District Accountability Subcommittee's activity.

He reported that he had been exchanging emails with Scott Trimble and that issues were under consideration. Anne Keene noted that House Bill 53 did not require district accountability but rather mentioned that such issues were mentioned as a possibility. Benny Lile asked Deputy Commissioner Randy Kimbrough if her staff could assist with the work of his subcommittee. Randy indicated that her staff could provide assistance.

9. Naming CATS Assessment Components

Anne Keene

Anne Keene led the Council into the agenda item dealing with naming the CATS assessment components. Anne reported that Robyn Oatley has only received two suggestions neither of which were appropriate. Maynard Thomas suggested Kentucky Education Assessment and Accountability Test. The Council discussed options included The Kentucky Core Content Assessment or Tests; and Kentucky's Test. Anne Keene noted that Robyn Oatley had informed her that there had been little new feedback from the field since her last report on communications.

Two other possible names were mentioned for the test: Assessment for Students in Kentucky and Kentucky Assessment of Students.

10. Writing Advisory Committee Report

Sue Rigney

The Writing Advisory Committee's recommendations will be presented to the Kentucky Board of Education. One of the key issues deals with reduction of time spent on scoring and production of portfolio entries. Sue also emphasized that the recommendations and practices within the report of the Committee were formulated by experienced writing

teachers. One part of the recommendation has practical strategies for classroom use. Sue reported that there had been research on reduction of the number of pieces required and scored for the portfolio. The report finds that the reduced number of entries resulted in lower scores rather than higher scores. One reason for this finding seems to be that fewer pieces provide the scorer with less opportunity to evaluate the writers' skills. Of course, the major caveat to the findings is that the portfolios had not been developed with the reduced number as a given factor. The Writing Advisory Committee recommended that the portfolio be included in the accountability index and that writing should be weighted at 3% for the on-demand writing prompt and 12% for the writing portfolio.

The Chair recessed the Council for dinner.
Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council; a quorum of 9 was present.

11. NTAPAA Report

Sue Rigney

Sue Rigney was recognized to introduce for discussion the National Technical Advisory Panel on Accountability and Assessment report "Results of Panel Discussions Regarding The Design of the CATS Accountability Model and Responses to Questions of the Council Regarding Technical Issues Surrounding CATS". Her intent was to give a few highlights from the document prior to the Council taking up the specifics of the paper tomorrow. Council members were asked to read through the document and consider any questions that Dr. Catterall could answer in the morning during the telephone conference.

Sue used chart paper to discuss some of the key issues. One of the NTAPAA's work involves defining terminology. One of the basic recommendations of the Panel is that Kentucky consider a Kentucky Accountability Improvement Model (AIM) that sets fixed annual targets for growth, and then implements accountability by determining where a school is placed on an evaluative scale (the school's standing) and then judges the amount of growth evidenced by the school each biennium. Also included would be identifiers of "declined, maintained, progressed, or progressed strongly (thus a growth scale). Sue asked Dr. Jerry Lunney to make comments since he was also at the NTAPAA meeting when these ideas were formulated. He suggested that this model would permit the possibility of an additional reward point. A classification might be Low Decline; Medium Maintain; High Progress.

Chairperson Anne Keene asked Scott Trimble to generalize about what the bottom most range of school indices are currently and what the highest range indices are. Scott said that the lowest indices might be some in the 20's and on up to 30-40 ranges; the highest would fall somewhere in the 60-70's. Scott was asked to provide the Council with the specific data at tomorrow's session.

Sue noted that there would still be some degree of relative comparison between schools/districts over the short run, but in the transition toward 2000 and beyond, that relative comparison would decrease so that schools would not be ranked in relationship to other schools statewide.

Council members discussed some of the issues surrounding the classification designations and qualifiers of Low, Medium, and High to go with Decline, Maintain, Progress.

Benny Lile asked about adjustments which would require work on equating and scaling. It would seem that this would be necessary or at least desirable. Sue Rigney repeated NTAPAA's advice that now is the time to make any changes in scaling and equating while the new models are being developed. Benny Lile suggested that the model given may actually weight the score points by giving a kind of "partial credit" and thereby make the attainment of the 100 goal by 2014 more attainable.

Gary Mielcarek asked if the past problems with the cohort model would still pose serious problems. While this is a possible area of concern, it seems that there might be a way to work with a cohort in a valid manner.

The Council members were asked to review the NTAPAA document as carefully as possible and have questions ready for Dr. Catterall.

Another major decision is whether or not and how to reset standards. NTAPAA has said that there are a number of reasons to believe that the standards used to assign students to the Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished categories will need to be reset for CATS.

12. SCAAC Next Day Meeting

Anne Keene

Chairperson Anne Keene asked the Council to decide the beginning time for tomorrow's session taking into consideration Dr. James Catterall's phone conference schedule. The Council will begin its session at 8:30 a.m.

Sue Rigney reported back to the Council that Dr. Catterall would only be available for the telephone conference tomorrow morning between 9 and 9:30 a.m.; the Council was asked to formulate questions for him.

Adjournment

SCAAC Motion:

Kay Freeland moved for adjournment; Gary Mielcarek seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned.